

REMARKS

Claims remaining in the present patent application are Claims 4, 5, 7, 19-22 and 24-27. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above captioned patent application.

Claims 4, 5, 7, 19-22 and 24-27 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Reber et al (US 6,418,325, “Reber”) in view of Pallakoff (US 2002/0151283 A1, “Pallakoff”).

Applicants note that Claims 4, 5, 7, 19-22 and 24-27 were allowed in the Office Action of November 24, 2003. Applicants respectfully note that MPEP § 706.04 indicates that “it is unusual to reject a previously allowed claim” and instructs the Examiner that “great care” is to “be exercised in authorizing such a rejection.” Applicants regret that Claims 4, 5, 7, 19-22 and 24-27 stand rejected.

With respect to Claim 4, Applicants have reviewed the cited art and respectfully assert that neither Reber nor Pallakoff, alone or in combination, teach, suggest or disclose the limitations of this Claim.

With respect to Claim 4, Applicants assert that Reber does not teach, suggest or disclose the limitation of comprising first and second display screen units as recited in Claim 4. Applicants are confused by the citation of Reber “figure 4 item 10.” Applicants respectfully assert that Reber item 10 is consistently identified as a “touchpad.” Applicants understand a touchpad to be substantially different in form and function from a display screen or device as the

term is used within Reber to refer to item 44. The items shown on touch pad 10 are “printed” thereon, not displayed.

In addition, Applicants respectfully assert that Reber does not teach, suggest or disclose the limitation of “a display screen region … identified by permanent printing” as recited in Claim 4. Reber’s discussion of permanent printing refers to touchpad 10 and not to a display device, e.g., display 44.

Pallakoff does not correct the deficiencies of Reber. Applicants respectfully assert that Pallakoff does not teach, suggest or disclose the limitation of “a display screen region … identified by permanent printing” as recited in Claim 4. Therefore the combination of Pallakoff and Reber fails to teach or suggest these claim limitations.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 4 overcomes the rejection of record and respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

The rejections of Claims 5, 7, 19-22 and 24-27 depend upon the combination of Reber and Pallakoff. For these Claims, the Office Action alleges that the combination of Reber and Pallakoff “was found to already read on most of the limitations....” As described above, a combination of Reber and Pallakoff does not read on most of the limitations of such Claims. For this reason, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 5, 7, 19-22 and 24-27 overcome the rejections of record and respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

With respect to Claim 5, Applicants have reviewed the cited art and respectfully assert that neither Reber nor Pallakoff, alone or in combination, teach, suggest or disclose the limitation of “displaying said information on said first display screen unit automatically in response to a signal for turning off said second display screen unit” as recited in Claim 5. The Office Action confirms that Reber does not teach “turning off said second display and displaying said information on said first display screen unit.” Pallakoff does not correct this deficiency. Pallakoff teaches “displays on the device can be turned off or dimmed or idled....” [0015] (emphasis added). Pallakoff further teaches that “a handset can be designed to have a button... that the user uses to ...turn the microdisplay on....” [0039]. However, Pallakoff fails to teach, suggest or disclose any automatic method or means for displaying particular information on a display responsive to turning another display off.

For this additional reason, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 5 overcomes the rejection of record and respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

With respect to Claim 7, Applicants have reviewed the cited art and respectfully assert that neither Reber nor Pallakoff, alone or in combination, teach, suggest or disclose the limitation of “sending information for a clock display to said first display screen unit automatically in response to a signal for turning off said second display screen unit” as recited in Claim 7.

As discussed previously, Pallakoff fails to teach, suggest or disclose any automatic method or means for displaying particular information on a display responsive to turning another display off. In addition, Applicants respectfully

assert that Pallakoff is silent as to the meaning of the date and time text shown in Figure 6. Pallakoff describes the image as that of an “instant message” [0064]. It is well known to include sending date and/or time information in such messages and it is quite possible that Figure 6 is showing date and time information indicating when the message was sent (or received) or other uses of date and time information, and not current “clock information.”

Further, Pallakoff Figure 6 shows both displays in an “on” state, actively displaying information. Clearly, the date and time information shown in Figure 6 is not displayed responsive to turning the other display off! In this manner, Pallakoff actually teaches away from embodiments of the present invention.

For these additional reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 7 overcomes the rejection of record and respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

With respect to Claim 19, Applicants respectfully assert that, as shown previously, Reber and Pallakoff, alone or in combination, fail to teach, suggest or disclose the limitation of “(a) display screen region identified by permanent printing” as recited by Claim 19.

For this additional reason, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 19 overcomes the rejection of record and respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

With respect to Claim 20, Applicants have reviewed the cited art and respectfully assert that neither Reber nor Pallakoff, alone or in combination, teach, suggest or disclose the limitation of “wherein said first display screen unit

is configured to turn on automatically in response to a signal turning off said second display screen unit” as recited in Claim 20. As discussed previously with respect to Claim 5, Pallakoff describes a system in which “displays on the device can be turned off or dimmed or idled....” [0015] (emphasis added). Pallakoff does not teach, suggest or disclose any means for, or method of, turning on a display responsive to turning another display off.

For this additional reason, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 20 overcomes the rejection of record and respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

With respect to Claim 21, Applicants have reviewed the cited art and respectfully assert that neither Reber nor Pallakoff, alone or in combination, teach, suggest or disclose the limitation of “wherein said first display screen unit is specialized for a clock display” as recited in Claim 21. The Office Action cites Pallakoff Figure 6 showing direct-view display 600. The direct-view display is described as “like those on most cell phones or PDAs in use in 2001” [0007]. Such displays are typically general-purpose displays, e.g., rows and columns of display elements that can be individually addressed. Indeed, the descriptions and depictions of direct-view displays in Pallakoff are consistent with such general-purpose displays. Applicants respectfully assert that such a general-purpose display screen as shown in Pallakoff is not “specialized for a clock display” as recited in Claim 21.

For this additional reason, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 21 overcomes the rejection of record and respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

With respect to Claim 24, Applicants have reviewed the cited art and respectfully assert that neither Reber nor Pallakoff, alone or in combination, teach, suggest or disclose the limitation of “(a) display screen region identified by permanent printing” as recited by Claim 24.

Further, Applicants respectfully assert that Reber and Pallakoff, alone or in combination, fail to teach, suggest or disclose the limitation of “displaying secondary information on a second display screen (responsive to) an incoming phone call and wherein said secondary information is a dialog enabling the receipt of said phone call” as recited in Claim 24. The Office Action cites Pallakoff Figure 5 items 500-503. Pallakoff 500 and 501 are displays, while 502 and 503 are displayed images. Applicants respectfully assert that none of Pallakoff items 500-503 has anything to do with a phone call, let alone with being responsive to an incoming phone call.

The Office Action further cites Reber Figure 2 item 72. Reber’s “sixth icon 72 for initiating a phone book command” is printed on touchpad 10, which as pointed out previously is not a display. It is well-known that “a phone book command” icon is utilized to open a phone book application that is associated with placing a phone call rather than receiving one.

For these additional reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 24 overcomes the rejection of record and respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

With respect to Claim 25, Applicants have reviewed the cited art and respectfully assert that neither Reber nor Pallakoff, alone or in combination,

teach, suggest or disclose the limitation of “(a) display screen region identified by permanent printing” as recited by Claim 25.

Further, Applicants respectfully assert that neither Reber nor Pallakoff, alone or in combination, teach, suggest or disclose the limitation of “in response to an event, displaying secondary information on a second display screen region... wherein said event is the receipt of a short message and wherein said secondary information is the body of said short message” as recited by Claim 25.

Pallakoff teaches [0064] that the user can read an instant message on the device. However, Pallakoff is silent with respect to displaying such a message responsive to receipt of such message. As is well known, it is common for such devices to display a list of received email messages and/or short messages in order for a user to select a particular message from such list for display.

For these additional reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 25 overcomes the rejections of record and respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Reber in view of Pallakoff and further in view of Horie et al. (US 20020058529 A1 “Horie”). Applicants have reviewed the cited art and respectfully assert that neither Reber nor Pallakoff nor Horie, alone or in combination, teach, suggest or disclose the limitations of this Claim.

With respect to Claim 22, Applicants respectfully assert that, as shown previously, Reber and Pallakoff, alone or in combination, fail to teach, suggest or

disclose the limitation of “(a) display screen region identified by permanent printing” as recited by Claim 22. Horie does not correct this deficiency.

For this additional reason, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 22 overcomes the rejections of record and respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Reber in view of Pallakoff and further in view of Lui et al. (US 6,552,719 “Lui”). Applicants have reviewed the cited art and respectfully assert that neither Reber nor Pallakoff nor Lui, alone or in combination, teach, suggest or disclose the limitations of this Claim.

Applicants respectfully assert that Lui does not teach, disclose or suggest the limitation of “in response to an event, displaying secondary information on a second display screen... wherein... said secondary information is a keyboard image” as recited by Claim 27. Applicants respectfully assert that Lui teaches “a method and system for automatically determining when an application should switch from a writing mode to a text entry mode, and vice-versa (Abstract). It is clear that Lui teaches such systems and methods for a device comprising a single display. In this manner, Lui teaches away from embodiments of the present invention.

For this additional reason, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 27 overcomes the rejection of record and respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

CONCLUSION

Claims remaining in the present patent application are Claims 4, 5, 7, 19-22 and 24-27.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP



Anthony C. Murabito
Reg. No. 35,295

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060

Date: 6/21/2004